

decency; write National Teenagers Day Committee, 582 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles 46, Calif., concerning other suggested programs; have school dress-up campaign and/or sponsor boys' and girls' fashion shows; prove that it is not "sissy," that it is decent; let people know that teenagers are decent, not delinquent.

4. Build a complete and happy life by daily mental, physical, and moral improvement; obtain and use better reading program material; emphasize good study habits, athletic competition, regular medical checkups, etc.; pay tribute through public recognition for high mental, physical, and moral achievement; arrange Career Days to show need for education in all fields; assist Kiwanis Career Day program, science fairs and mathematical competitions; consider establishing a scholarship for the most deserving.

5. Realize that a family based upon love and mutual respect is necessary for a responsible community; plan an Honor Thy Parents Week; say family grace at meals; advocate family vacations; plan Key Club family socials; encourage individual respect and pride of all members of the family unit; learn to appreciate the wisdom and knowledge of your parents.

6. Encourage school achievement and stimulate student-faculty cooperation; request and use Youth Salutes Its Teachers kit; spearhead school beautification programs; encourage good grades for members, and, through example, for the complete student body; set up programs to give lessons, text, and tutoring to ill student stay-at-homes; develop programs for building school spirit and good sportsmanship; help your fellow students excel in their school activities.

7. As a citizen of a democracy, spearhead an appreciation of your heritage; request and put into operation the "CQ" (citizenship quotient) program material; cooperate in disaster relief and worthwhile community charity drives; invite students who are not club members to attend club meetings; urge participation in Voice of Democracy contest; urge a study of the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and the British North American Act; plan municipal government study groups; ready yourself by education and experience to accept your democratic responsibilities.

8. Promote international understanding by taking an active interest in world affairs; schedule Key Club fundraisers with proceeds going to UNESCO, Crusade for Freedom, CARE, or other worthwhile charitable organizations; take part in Kiwanis-sponsored United States-Canada Good Will Week (April 24-30, 1960); have carefully selected "pen pals" abroad; take an active part in the United Nations Day programs; individually budget time and urge others to do the same in order to read about and intelligently understand world affairs; study other countries—land, customs, people, and history.

Mr. Veteran on Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERWIN MITCHELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the April 2, 1960, issue of one of our best and most influential

publications on military and veterans' matters, Army Times, an editorial entitled "Mr. Veteran on Hill." This editorial called attention to the tremendous contribution in the field of veterans' legislation which has been made by our distinguished colleague from Texas the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We in this body are keenly aware of the conscientious and devoted manner in which our friend has led us in the multiple and complex problems arising in the field of veterans' affairs. It has been an inspiration to me to observe one who, while working unceasingly to obtain just benefits for the veterans of our Nation, has at the same time kept in perspective the interest of the taxpayers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include this article and commend it to the attention of the membership:

MR. VETERAN ON HILL

We hear that \$1,000 is being offered to the person who can name any Member now serving in Congress who has authored more benefit legislation for war veterans than has Texas' hard-working representative OLIN E. "TIGER" TEAGUE.

That's one proposition which will find no takers. Mr. TEAGUE's accomplishments in the field of veterans' legislation run to imposing lengths. His efforts have not been entirely devoted to war veterans. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee which he chairs recently completed extensive hearings on extending GI bill benefits to peacetime veterans.

During 14 years on Capitol Hill, the Texas lawmaker has achieved vast increases in service-connected compensation for disabled veterans and survivors of the war dead; he has been the principal advocate and supporter of the Veterans' Administration hospital program; he authored the Korea GI bill which has benefited over 6 million veterans; and he pushed through a liberal pension increase last year that will benefit some 1 million of the country's older veterans, their widows and children.

His legislative achievements for veterans have drawn endorsement from all of the major veterans' organizations, including the American Legion, the American Veterans of War II and Korea (Amvets), the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) and the Veterans of World War I.

The various veterans benefit programs fathered by Mr. TEAGUE have shown careful balance between the just needs of veterans and their dependents—and the interest of the taxpaying public as well.

By astute judgment and professional handling of the veterans benefit programs, the Texas lawmaker has avoided the always-present danger of public reaction against any hint of a "gravy train" philosophy.

The measure of his accomplishment is further enhanced when one recalls the persistence with which TEAGUE has worked for passage of a sound and just "cold war" GI bill. Final enactment rests on many uncertain factors.

One factor is certain, however. On the cold war issue, "TIGER" has made it plain he will not be listed among those who maintain we are in a period of peace—with regard to readjustment benefit proposals—but in a cold war for purposes of foreign aid, armaments expenditure, crash programs for outer space, and compulsory military service.

Freedom of Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va., of April 4, 1960, entitled "Freedom of Choice."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

It is about time that we Virginians stand back a bit and admire the two new freedoms, still in swaddling clothes, that were born at this time last year when the general assembly delivered itself of the revolutionary freedom of choice school plan. The law creating these freedoms has just been strengthened and reenacted, without one single adverse vote, which must mean that it is now the settled policy of Virginia.

Few people in this State and fewer still outside this State know that Virginia offers to every child—black child or white child, rich or poor—the individual option of attendance at a public school or a scholarship for use in any qualified private or public school in the entire world, in England, in Switzerland, in, if you please, darkest Ghana.

Involved in this are these individual freedoms:

Freedom of association, by which is meant the individual freedom to associate as one pleases and the individual freedom not to associate as one pleases, the latter of which of course takes precedence because otherwise there is no freedom.

Freedom of education, by which is meant the individual freedom to accept a State-directed education or to arrange a private education. This new freedom marks the first time in American history that a State has given up, voluntarily, its monopoly in education that comes about by the use of educational tax money in public institutions only.

The first of these great freedoms also marks the first instance of State action against the welling movement in this country to dictate the citizen's association in matters of employment, trade, housing, and of course education. An instance of what we mean is the recent action by the New York Antidiscrimination Commission against the employment of British secretaries, which would be laughable were it not so unctuously serious. No fewer than 14 States now have laws denying the individual freedom of choice in real estate, and 4 of them go so far as to force the individual to rent or sell wholly owned private property to anybody.

Before we set out the terms of the new Virginia scholarship law—thus far widely misinterpreted—let us recall the comment by the late Judge John J. Parker on the Supreme Court's decision of 1954. Judge Parker pointed out a distinction never adequately appreciated, that the intention of the Court was to prohibit State-enforced segregation, but not to require State-enforced integration. This must mean that what the Supreme Court really undertook to guarantee back in 1954, without understanding its implications fully at the time, was the indi-

vidual freedom to associate as one pleases—without interference by State, or any other law.

On that premise, Virginia now has stepped aside and allowed her citizens to arrange their private education in any way they want. At the same time other States, misreading the Warren opinion, have been denying this very same individual freedom. Of course a clash will come, and in that clash the Supreme Court will be forced either to yield a State the power to prescribe association—which means either segregation or integration—or to yield the individual the freedom to do as he chooses. The Virginia fight in that contest will be to add to the four famous freedoms of the first amendment which she herself defined—of speech, of press, of religion, of assembly—the new freedoms of association and of education.

Now this, quite obviously, is a tremendous thing. Yet not one single word of it has been reported, let alone commented upon, in the national press. There are two reasons for this:

First is the unfortunate fact that freedom of choice has been badly reported as meaning, in the one case, local option, or alternatively, pupil placement, neither of which has anything whatever to do with it. Because of this reporting, Georgia just lately has been told that the Virginia freedom of choice plan, said to be working so well, was nothing but the North Carolina placement plan. Another common mistake, gleefully repeated by such papers as the Washington Post, is that the Virginia scholarships, erroneously supposed to be geared to segregation situations only, have gone astray, and that the general assembly in its dumbness has given them to everybody.

On top of all this foolishness, from which the Virginia press itself is not blameless, Freedom of Choice just cannot get a hearing in the national press, which is to say the northern press, because the plan grew out of segregation. Here we have a plain instance of guilt by association. In answer we submit that only a put-upon people ever can be expected to come up with anything new, and that the South, challenged in the Toynbee sense, has made its response. Moreover, every single one of our freedoms is soundly based on a defense of those with whom we disagree, even down to the ultimate minority of one. But does the North consider that fact? Hardly.

And, now, the terms of the Scholarship Act itself, which bear repeating because of the importance this act may have for Richmond and other troubled areas this fall:

The State offers out of its own coffers \$125 and \$150, respectively, to elementary and secondary school pupils. In addition, it guarantees by assessment on localities to make up the difference between these grants and the least of these three amounts: (1) actual tuition cost, (2) locality operating cost, or (3) \$250 and \$275, respectively. Apart from this, the locality is left free to add to the scholarships whatever it pleases, which means there is no "maximum," although public school operating cost has been the rationale of such places as Charlottesville.

The qualification of private schools is left to the State Department of Education, with this one restriction: the school must be non-sectarian. This is the one legally questionable aspect of the scholarship law and the assembly has taken care of it by adding a section affirming its willingness to give the scholarships to whomsoever a court might decide.

To sum up, Virginia has discovered and agreed to the freedom of association and it has invented the freedom of education to make that first freedom possible. And we are learning to live with these new freedoms. Already the Negro candidate for the Charlottesville City Council has espoused them,

and so will everybody else—in time. The reason we know this is that everybody now accepts, no matter his own beliefs, the freedom of speech for other people * * * and we are dealing here with exactly the same fundamental thing.

He Used Tax Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Woodrow Wilson said, while a professor of history at Princeton, that the power of the Congress to conduct legislative hearings and make investigations was as important as the power to make laws.

This power to investigate has been under criticism of late years largely due to the fact that it has been abused by some legislative committees. One would naturally expect that any group or organization would feel they were being "picked on" when called before a legislative investigating committee.

But over the years, some dangers have become apparent because of the methods and attitude displayed by some investigating committees—for various reasons. It was never intended that these committees should investigate purely for political advantage.

I am sure it was never intended that tax dollars would be used simply to propagandize some theory of government. A few years ago a branch of the Federal Government, the State Department, was accused—and many thought rightfully—of using its appropriations to sell their own theories of foreign affairs to the taxpayers. Taxpayers were being sold a "bill of goods" by the use of their own money.

A great deal of discussion has been had in connection with some investigations that have been conducted recently in regard to high costs of drugs in the pharmaceutical field.

I append hereto an article from the Chattanooga News Free Press in regard to some of the dangers involved in conducting legislative investigations:

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Mar. 9, 1960]

HE USED TAX MONEY

Several weeks ago, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, called attention to the fact that Senator ESTES KEFAUVER is asking \$425,000 of the taxpayers' money for a variety of investigations to be initiated at his whim without approval by the entire Senate Judiciary Committee.

Chattanooga got a taste the other day of one very questionable phase of the way the tax funds allocated to the Kefauver subcommittee are spent.

To this city came one Paul Rand Dixon, who is counsel and staff director of the Kefauver subcommittee. Mr. Rand did not come here to investigate anything. He did not come to counsel the subcommittee or to direct its staff. His purpose was to appear on a program in which he was asked questions about the drug probe. He used

the occasion to continue the one-sided propaganda which has characterized the probe from the beginning.

And who paid Mr. Dixon's expenses to come to Chattanooga and propagandize? He was asked the question. He answered:

"My responsibility is to the subcommittee and I came here at the expense of this group."

In other words, the money of the taxpayers was used to finance the propagandizing appearance of the Kefauver subcommittee counsel and staff director.

He is not an elected public official. He does not represent constituents. He is supposed to develop facts for the Senate. But here we see tax money spent to put him before the public with his tale. And the kind of tales coming from the subcommittee may be seen in the spectacular claim that one drug manufacturer charged a price on one item that gave a profit of 1,118 percent—when the facts, later brought out with much less fanfare, showed the company's base profit was only 12.3 percent. The 1,118 percent figure had been fraudulently arrived at by a process equivalent to a claim that bread ought to cost only half a cent a loaf if that's what the wheat in it cost on the farm.

Democratic process is not being served by the use of tax money to finance propaganda appearances by the salaried counsel of a Senate subcommittee.

"Employment Insurance" Instead of "Unemployment Insurance"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 5, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Carroll County Times, published at Westminster, Md., there appeared a well written editorial which, I believe, presents a viewpoint worthy of consideration. It concerns the present use of the terms, "unemployment insurance" and "unemployment office," with the suggestion that we instead should use the terms, "employment insurance" and "employment office." The editorial was written by Mr. Charles Mooshian, editor of the Carroll County Times, a good friend of mine.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—A POSITIVE TITLE FOR A POSITIVE PROGRAM

We have yet to hear of a life insurance agent extoll the virtues of death insurance, yet everyday dedicated employees of the Bureau of Employment Security in Westminster, Md., and around the Nation are subjected to the use of a negative title for a positive program—"unemployment insurance."

To us, no single program, developed during the early days of the New Deal, has benefited the workingman as the (un)employment insurance program, originally designated as unemployment compensation.

Enacted into law along with social security and the strong, vigorous, and close-knit nationwide employment service sys-